



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RESPONSE TO THE AUGUST 28, 2003 OFFICE ACTION

APPLICANT: Oliver Heid GROUP ART UNIT: 2862

SERIAL NO.: 09/840,577 EXAMINER: D. Vargas

FILED: April 23, 2001 CONFIRMATION NO.: 3801

TITLE: "ELECTRICAL COIL"

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

SIR:

Applicant and his counsel have carefully reviewed the Office Action dated August 28, 2003, and the references relied upon by the Examiner, but believe the claims in their present form are patentably distinguishable over the teachings of those references. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following arguments in support of patentability is therefore respectfully requested.

R E M A R K S

In the Office Action dated August 28, 2003, claims 1-8, 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sellers et al. Claims 1-8 and 10 additionally were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nerreter.

These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The Examiner cited language at column 4, lines 25-44 of the Sellers et al reference as providing a teaching of a non-resinous heat insulator disposed between at least one section of the conductor and the carrier structure. It is true that the language cited by the Examiner in Sellers et al describes a gradient coil system wherein the gradient coils are at least partially embedded in a reaction resin molding material that

RECEIVED  
NOV -5 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800